

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 remain pending in this application for which applicants seek reconsideration.

Amendment

Independent claims 1 and 4-7 have been amended to more clearly define the invention. In this respect, each of these claims now positively defines a directivity control circuit for controlling a delay setting for each of the delay circuits based on a desired focal position of a sound wave beam to be directed to and a position of each of the speaker units. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Griesinger (USP 5,109,419). Claims 1-5 and 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Griesinger in view of Yeap (USP 4,118,601).

Applicants traverse the art rejections because none of these references would have disclosed or taught an array speaker unit with a directivity control circuit for controlling a delay setting for each of its delay circuits based on a desired focal position of a sound wave beam to be directed to and a position of each of its speaker units, i.e., to emit a sound wave beam toward the focal position. Each of the speaker units receives a set delay from one of the delay circuits to emit a plurality of sounds from the speaker units in accordance with the output sound signals in different directivities to emit the sound wave beam to the focal position.

Examiner is now relying upon Griesinger for the proposition that an array speaker system that uses delay for directivity control and microphone for sound adjusting control is known. Although Griesinger discloses simulating  $N$  (number of speakers)  $\times$   $M$  (number of microphone) channels with an array of independently operated reverb units 50, applicants submit that the reverb units 50 do not control the directivity of the array speaker unit. Accordingly, applicants submit that Griesinger would not have anticipated any of previously presented claims. In other words, Griesinger has no directivity control circuit. In this respect, independent claims 1 and 4-7 now positively defines the directivity control circuit to more clearly define over Griesinger.

As the claims now positively define a directivity control circuit in an array speaker unit, applicants submit that claims 1-13 clearly define over the applied references. Note that Yeap would not have alleviated Griesinger's shortcomings.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-13 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

20 JUNE 2008

DATE

/Lyle Kimms 062008/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. No. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826  
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826  
703-726-6020 (PHONE)  
703-726-6024 (FAX)